

1996

Student change leadership, a renewal process for organizations : a case study of the 1995 Panhellenic rush revision

Melanie Sandukas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sandukas, Melanie, "Student change leadership, a renewal process for organizations : a case study of the 1995 Panhellenic rush revision" (1996). *Honors Theses*. 1181.

<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/1181>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

Student Change Leadership--

A Renewal Process For Organizations

A Case Study of the 1995 Panhellenic Rush Revision

by

Melanie Sandukas

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

April, 1996

**Student Change Leadership--
A Renewal Process For Organizations:
A Case Study of the 1995 Panhellenic Rush Revision
by
Melanie Sandukas**

**Senior Project
Jepson School of Leadership Studies
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA**

April 1996

Phi Beta Kappa, the first Greek-letter society, was established at William and Mary in 1776 for the cultivation of friendship and the appreciation of literature. This organization was the model for later secret societies that perpetuated the Greek ideal of friendship and preserved traditions through rituals and music. Our modern fraternity system was established on the same principles of friendship, morality, scholarship, and leadership--expressed differently by each chapter in their secret rites. However, as the National Panhellenic Conference Chair, Mrs. Jeanne Scott, explained in her speech to University of Richmond sorority members on February 26, 1996, the Greek system often fails to reflect these values to our media saturated society. A survey of newspaper headlines produces hundreds of articles documenting the negative products of individual chapters: alcohol abuse, hazing incidents, deaths. Mrs. Scott challenged our system to combat this negative publicity in two ways--by looking inward to reaffirm our true purpose and reaching out to share our ideals with others.

Greek organizations experienced a national revival in the late eighties. According to Mrs. Scott's figures, rush participation increased on sixty percent of campuses in 1995. However, in these times of negative publicity and litigation, nervous university administrators question the merit of the Greek system. In "The Survival of Greek Life: Concerns and Solutions" Robert Ackerman states, "The fact that change is necessary suggests that some fraternities and sororities are falling short of the ideals upon which they were founded." He observes, "Change, when it does occur, all too often appears to result from an attempt to avoid problems or from a need to lessen the negative impact of an existing problem" (78). Greek leaders at the University of Richmond are aware of the challenges facing their organizations; they want to address problems in the system before a state of crisis exists. The Panhellenic Council Executive Board, the governing body of the University of Richmond sorority system, is trying to change negative public perceptions and encourage participation in the system through a return to the basic values of the organizations.

Panhellenic and sorority officers are student leaders. Required to manage the daily functions of their organizations, they must also provide the vision to enable the system to evolve and survive. Ackerman cautions, "Greeks have long held a special place in campus life. But without a concerted renewal effort indicating that fraternities and sororities can adapt to the changing campus environment, that place may soon be forfeited" (81). As a 1995 sorority president, I had the opportunity to practice the skills I was studying in the Jepson School of Leadership Studies. Furthermore, I witnessed a major change initiative--the revision of the University of Richmond Panhellenic Rush process. Developed and implemented by student leaders in cooperation with the Director for Greek Life, Alison Bartel-Lord, the change was designed to combat the rush decline we had experienced in previous years. The successful revision renewed our system; participation increased. In addition, the changes implemented during rush forced the organizations involved to focus on their founding principles and communicate these to the campus community. This proactive change was precisely the type of initiative Mrs. Scott, the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC), and concerned advisors are advocating for the preservation of the Greek system.

Krysinski and Reed identify three phases of a change project-- (1) awareness of the need for change, identification of specific reasons, strategy development; (2) implementation and training; (3) monitoring and evaluating the plan (67). The rush revision was a process based on resolutions made on the national level by the NPC. The 1995 University of Richmond Panhellenic Council completed the first phase of the project and then implemented change during the second phase. Through this paper, I plan to contribute to the third phase of the project by analyzing the effects of the rush changes. Furthermore, I hope to demonstrate the influence of student involvement in campus organizations by using the Panhellenic project as a successful leadership example.

Student involvement in cocurricular activities is often criticized by faculty as a negative distraction from academics. *In fact, student leadership in campus organizations is an important component of the experiential learning process in college. This case study will demonstrate the impact of student change leadership on Greek organizations, their viability, and the members involved in the process.*

METHOD

This senior paper is a retrospective study of a change project I was involved in during my sorority leadership experience. In a discussion of qualitative research, Stephen Cole identifies participant observation as a primary research design. The researcher takes extensive field notes while interacting with the subject group for an extended time (77). As the president of a sorority, I participated in the revision of rush and observed the leadership effort involved during the period of a year. However, I was not aware I would later use my experience as the basis for my senior assignment. Therefore, this is a combination research paper on a project. Qualitative research on the 1995 Panhellenic change process was conducted by examining the documents produced and by in-depth interviewing the student leaders (see Appendix A). I used the "triangulation" method, interviewing several subjects about the same event (Cole 101), to construct an accurate picture of the change process.

RELATED RESEARCH

To understand the issues that affected the change process of the 1995 Panhellenic Rush Revision, we must first examine the attitudes and research concerning student involvement in cocurricular¹ activities, the effects of Greek membership, and the consequences of the rush process. Furthermore, leadership and change theories are

¹The term cocurricular is used interchangeably with extracurricular to refer to the activities students participate in outside of their academic courses during the college career. Cocurricular does imply an emphasis on campus activities, while extracurricular can include any additional organizational involvement.

discussed to provide a framework for the case study on student change leadership in the Greek system.

Student Involvement

University faculty and administrators have voiced the concern that participation in cocurricular activities interferes with academic achievement, competing for student time and attention. However, when Cooper, Healy, and Simpson surveyed the literature they discovered, "Research on traditional age college students shows that students who are involved in cocurricular activities report more positive educational and social experiences overall, increased intellectual and leadership development, success in academic and career goals, and are more likely to graduate" (98). Abrahamowicz conducted a study which compared student satisfaction with college life between members of organizations and those students who were not involved on campus. He concluded that "participation in student organizations seems to lead to greater involvement in the overall college experience. Involvement of this nature and to this extent is likely to result in a higher quality educational experience" (Abrahamowicz 237). The study found that active students were also involved in pursuits beyond the "traditional domain" of their organizations. Abrahamowicz states, "The members of organizations who participated in this study indicated significantly greater involvement than nonmembers in the library; with faculty; with course learning; with art, music, and theater; with writing; with science and technology; and with conversations" (236). These observations suggest that cocurricular involvement increases college satisfaction and results in more connection with the institution and educational activities.

In addition to academic considerations, researchers during the past two decades have explored the effects of college involvement on student development. Cooper, Healy, and Simpson used the Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI) to examine the relationship between student involvement and student development during the course of a college career. They discovered that "members of

student organizations demonstrated more growth than nonmembers in Developing Purpose, Educational Involvement, Career Planning, Lifestyle Planning, Life Management, Cultural Participation, and Academic Autonomy" (99). Alexander W. Astin, the foremost scholar on the benefits of cocurricular activities, summarized the various research on student development into "the student involvement theory":

Student involvement refers to the quantity and quality of the physical and psychosocial energy the student invests in the college experience. Such involvement takes many forms: absorption in academic work, participation in extracurricular activities, interaction with faculty members and other institutional personnel, and so forth. According to the theory, the greater the student's involvement in college, the greater the learning and personal development. (157)

Astin's research also indicated that increased involvement results in increased retention rates; his theory and findings provide educators motivation for designing more effective learning environments (156).

Cooper, Healy, and Simpson proposed an additional explanation for the development of active students--social connections with peers and other members of the campus community. The authors explain, "The changes that are related to membership and leadership in student organizations are developed through involvement in formal and informal activities that promote and support the development of relationships" (Cooper, Healy, and Simpson 101). The Greek system is a prime example of a group of student organizations that exists to foster relationships. Student organizations not only provide educational and developmental benefits that are unavailable in the classroom, they involve students with the programs and people of their college--encouraging students to complete their education (Abrahamowicz 237). Despite the research that supports both the academic and personal development of involved students, universities' continue to scrutinize social organizations.

Greek Membership and the Rush Process

David Ellis explains, "To faculty, the Greek focus on purely social activities has seemed contrary and even detrimental to the academic and intellectual priorities of higher education" (49). However, Pike and Askew examined the effects of Greek membership on students' academic experiences and discovered that criticisms of these organizations as antithetical to intellectual pursuits were unfounded (13). The difference researchers found between Greek and independent students' involvement in the academic life of the university was based on their attendance at different types of activities. Independents interact more with faculty and participate in more cultural events, but Greeks exert greater academic effort, belong to more clubs and student professional organizations, and interact more with other students (Pike and Askew 17).

Peer involvement is even cited by Hunt and Rentz as an additional method of learning. They argue that Greek "membership provides an environment where student learning outside the classroom is stimulated by the interaction of the varied personalities that come together" (Hunt and Rentz 289). Involvement in Greek organizations also results in interactions that enhance members' development. Hunt and Rentz did a study specific to involvement in Greek organizations using the SDTLI measures and received results similar to the activity involvement study by Cooper, Healy, and Simpson. They state, "Involvement, whether within the fraternity or sorority alone or in conjunction with other organized campus activities, was significantly related to: establishing and clarifying purpose; developing mature interpersonal relationships; and establishing an intimate relationship with another based on trust, reciprocal caring, and honesty" (Hunt and Rentz 293). Educators acknowledge the importance of personal development as part of the college experience, but they emphasize that academics should be the priority. Debate centers on the Greek system's relationship to the goals of the institution.

Scholars argue that the values of Greek organizations are incompatible with the intellectual values of the university; yet, Greek membership has neither a positive nor

negative impact on the attitude and value formation of college students (Baier and Whipple 44). When Carney Strange interpreted evidence from studies about the consequences of Greek membership, she arrived at three conclusions: (a) Greek members have different values than independents before they join the organization; (b) members who remain active through their college career experience less of a change toward the values of the school; (c) students in general are conforming less to these "values of the academy" compared to previous eras (520). She explains that modern students place more of an instrumental emphasis on education than the previous generation. Students are now motivated by career goals instead of introspective values of personal discovery.

Strange suggests that administrators cooperate with students and use the successful structure of the Greek system to reorient students toward the goals of the institution (521). Strange argues that "a good Greek system has all the necessary elements of a perfect developmental environment, especially for students in the early years of college life" (522). She explains:

It has a history and clear sense of mission with specific goals and rituals. It communicates that mission to prospective members with ease. It has an effective method of attracting, orienting, and matriculating new members [rush and the education program]. It provides members with a chance for meaningful achievement and leadership in various roles under the guidance and mentorship of more advanced members. Finally, Greek alumni keep in close touch after they leave the system through a well-organized network. (Strange 522)

Perhaps the goals of Greek organizations and those of educators are not mutually exclusive.

For students, Greek organizations provide a sense of identity and opportunities to form close friendships within the larger campus context (Ellis 49). Greeks argue that sororities create support networks that promote greater involvement in campus activities

(both in Greek and student organizations). Atlas and Morier decided that the support system provided by acceptance into a sorority during the college adjustment period--the access to social contacts and potential friends--could explain a drop in depression observed in accepted women (352).

In a discussion of rush and student self-image, Keller and Hart assert that the student satisfaction with the campus environment that results from Greek membership cannot necessarily be extended to include the rush process. Some students may suffer damage to self-esteem due to disappointment or rejection. The authors emphasize, "Rushees may find Greek life not to their liking, may resent the close social scrutiny candidates are sometimes expected to undergo, may fail to obtain a bid from the particular sorority or fraternity desired, or may not be invited to join any organization at all" (Keller and Hart 257). They recommend a review of the methods Greek organizations use to present themselves during rush programs; they suggest an increase in discussions about all aspects of Greek life and a decrease in the elaborate social events used to attract new members (Keller and Hart 260).

The University of Richmond Greek leaders are interested in focusing on the core values of their organizations to benefit interested students. The return to the organizations' ideals should also have a positive image impact on the campus community. However, as Atlas and Morier discovered, "Being accepted or rejected by the sorority system had demonstrable effects on women's perception of the sorority system and their level of depression. Rejected women rated the sorority rush process as less fair and less effective at getting to know persons than did accepted women" (351). In the past, the limitations of the sorority recruitment method (rush) prevented UR Greek leaders from achieving their goals of inclusion and positive recognition.

Leading Change for Renewal

Leadership scholars often identify change as a prerequisite for organizational survival; leaders must enable organizations to respond to their environment. For those

organizations that are experiencing decline, change is a strategy for renewal. Lippitt defines organizational renewal "as the process of initiating, creating, and confronting needed changes so as to make it possible for organizations to become or remain viable, to adapt to new conditions, to solve problems, to learn from experiences, and to move toward greater organizational maturity" (1). Organizations that remain static during a period of downward spiral have a guaranteed destination--the bottom. Mary Guy asserts, "Dysfunctional ways of dealing with decline take varying forms, ranging from total oblivion to denial to shortsighted attempts to fix the symptoms without treating the cause of the problem. The functional way to deal with decline is to directly confront it--to recognize it as something important that has to be dealt with as quickly and as thoroughly as possible" (152). Addressing the factors that created the problem usually involves change.

Simply stated, "Change can be defined as a planned or unplanned response of an organization to pressures" (Dalziel and Schoonover 10). According to Dalziel and Schoonover, organizational change is often guided by reactive measures instead of proactive planning based on sound principles (13). Leaders are responsible for recognizing the need for change and motivating others in the group to commit to a renewal strategy; overcoming resistance to change is a leadership challenge.

In Leading Change O'Toole explains, "Since the 1980's, it has become more widely accepted that change is the prime task of leaders and that the best measure of effective leadership is the behavior of followers. To the extent that followers embrace change, leaders can be said to be effective. Thus a sine qua non of effective leadership is the ability to overcome resistance to change among followers" (158). Members of organizations strive to maintain the status quo; change threatens established roles and accepted methods of operation. Because of individual concerns, people in all levels of an organization may negatively react to proposed reforms and impede the change process. O'Toole dubs this phenomenon "the ideology of comfort." He believes group

members are content with the established order because they have an invested interest in the system--power, status, beliefs (247-248). People do not welcome the prospect of adjusting to new routines or a different organizational culture, especially if changes are forced. The change agent's approach to reform often determines the level of resistance produced.

In The Leadership Challenge, Kouzes and Posner identify five leadership practices common to the successful leader--challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, encouraging the heart. These ideas are especially relevant to leading change and can serve as a model for the process. First, effective change agents challenge the status quo to seek new opportunities. These leaders accept risks in their quest for renewal--they recognize and support innovative ideas that are not guaranteed to improve the accepted system. Second, they develop these ideas into a vision for the organization. Stoner-Zemel defines vision as "a clearly articulated, results-oriented picture of a future you intend to create" (16). Change leaders explain their vision in terms of the followers' interests. This measure demonstrates the leader's commitment to involving followers in planning for the future. Furthermore, the participants realize they have a common objective (a successful organization). People who share a vision will support the changes necessary to achieve their goals. Stoner-Zemel emphasizes, "Goals determine your activities--which will lead to realization of your vision" (16). After group members enroll in the change effort by accepting the vision, the implementation process begins. This effort requires the active participation of followers.

O'Toole comments, "Bringing about change without imposing one's will on others is a paradoxical, but not impossible, art to master" (254). The change leader must foster collaboration to accomplish the objectives of the organization. In a summary of the literature on effective leadership styles Komives reports, "Propelled by James McGregor Burn's thinking on transformational leadership, researchers have identified enhanced

effectiveness in leaders who are caring, share power, inspire vision, believe in people, and blur the lines between followers and leaders" (103). Sharing information and empowering followers are two methods cited by the literature for creating a cooperative atmosphere for change. These factors are components of the third practice identified by Kouzes and Posner, enabling others to act.

Followers respond better to a change when they understand its origin and believe they share a common interest in the outcome; leaders can gain support for an idea by involving the followers in the planning process. Dalziel and Schoonover assert, "Change leaders share information with those most affected by change to instill consistent expectations about the change and its ramifications throughout the organization" (16). O'Toole advocates the practice of "values-based leadership." Based on integrity, trust, listening, and respect, the concept involves the cultivation of strong followership. He discovered that successful changes occurred in organizations that encouraged the participation of all levels in all stages of the process. The specifics of change were not imposed from the top (O'Toole 74).

Nanus states, "The leader's purpose as a change agent is to make the investment decisions and other organizational changes necessary to realize the vision" (141). Change requires detailed plans. According to Kouzes and Posner's model, the last practices necessary for effective leadership are modeling the way and encouraging the heart. The leader serves as a role model; he must be consistent with his beliefs and actively participate in projects designed to achieve the vision. During the course of these change actions, the leader must support the individuals involved in the effort. Genuine caring encourages others to persevere during difficult periods (Kouzes and Posner 12-13).

In one study of student leaders that focused on fraternity and sorority presidents, Posner and Brodsky found, "Effective student leaders were consistently viewed as challenging, inspiring, enabling, modeling, and encouraging more frequently than their

less effective counterparts" (118-119). The literature provides many accounts of successful change leadership in the corporate environment (e.g., Lee Iacocca at Chrysler). In comparison, there are not many examples of students leading change in their organizations.

The benefits of being involved on campus have been established--satisfaction with college life and personal development. Furthermore, Greek organizations provide their members with a peer support network which encourages participation in campus activities. However, to maintain their niche at universities across the nation, Greeks must change their negative behavior. The leaders of these organizations, in the interest of their continued existence, will need to initiate various reforms to improve their reputations and attract new members. The sorority rush process was one factor we had to alter at the University of Richmond to renew interest in our chapters. The case study of this process will address both the student leadership considerations and the change strategies involved in the evolution of our system.

THE 1995 PANHELLENIC RUSH REVISION

Twenty-six national women's fraternities comprise the National Panhellenic Conference, founded in 1903. According to the NPC, "It is the business of the conference to foster cooperative interfraternity relationships in the national organizations and the collegiate chapters of the NPC member groups and to cooperate with colleges and universities in maintaining the highest scholastic, social, and performance standards (Report 2). The NPC is the advising body of each College Panhellenic organization; the Panhellenic Council is the governing body of the women's Greek system at the University of Richmond. There are seven national sororities represented--Alpha Phi, Alpha Chi Omega, Delta Delta Delta, Delta Gamma, Kappa Alpha Theta, Kappa Kappa Gamma, and Pi Beta Phi. The Panhellenic President, Vice President Rush, VP Programming/Judicial, VP Publicity/Community Service, Secretary/Treasurer, and the Rho Chi (PX) Director are the six members of the Panhellenic Executive Council

(exec), elected each year by the outgoing executive officers and sorority presidents. Two delegates represent each sorority at weekly Panhellenic meetings and report back to their group during chapter meetings.

The Panhellenic Council is responsible for the programming and judicial issues of the women's Greek system. Panhellenic plans Greek Week, community service events, and educational programs. Furthermore, the executive officers work with the chapters to develop guidelines for Rush². The chapters vote to approve the proposed structure and rules of Rush each year. Panhellenic Exec resolves conflicts between chapters and sanctions sororities that violate the accepted regulations.

Each national fraternity is represented by four delegates at an annual conference of the National Panhellenic Conference; the group meets "to formulate unanimous agreements by which all member groups are bound, to recommend procedures which represent what NPC believes to be in the best interest of each College Panhellenic. . . ." (NPC, Report 2). Sorority rush has traditionally involved the use of theme parties to attract and meet potential members. However, recommendations from the 1991 national conference included concerns about the escalating costs of rush and "the image portrayed on some campuses by rush party entertainment and decorations" (NPC, Resolutions). The purpose of the rush process is to get to know new women and provide them with an opportunity to learn about the benefits of Greek affiliation. Therefore, the Panhellenic groups resolved to simplify rush by concentrating on the development of conversation skills instead of elaborate socials (NPC, Resolutions).

Compared to other schools, the University of Richmond women's Greek system did not have extreme rush practices. Budgets, decorations, and skits were restricted by the adopted Rush rules. However, experiences during Rush 1995 convinced

²The recruitment process used by Greek organizations is termed rush. Rush (with a capital R) refers to the formal period of sorority recruitment during the second week of spring semester at the University of Richmond.

Panhellenic leaders that further simplification of our Rush week would benefit the system.

History of Proposed Changes

Sorority recruitment at the University of Richmond is a mutual selection process involving decisions by the chapters and the rushees.³ Rushees are prepared for the event in the fall by rush counselors (Rho Chis), and Rush occurs during the second week of spring semester. Traditionally, participants attend rounds of parties for five days (there are some nights off between rounds)⁴. The sororities extend invitations to their favorite rushees for the next round, and the rushees respond to the organizations they are interested in learning more about. The number of parties each night is reduced as the week progresses, and both the chapters and the rushees become more selective. Quota (the maximum number of women the sororities can each accept) is set in the middle of the week by dividing the number of women still participating in Rush by the number of sororities. Theoretically, every interested woman has a place in the system. Preference parties conclude the week and involve a more serious ceremony designed to illustrate the bond of sisterhood. After attending the last party, rushees rank their remaining choices; the chapters create a Bid List of desired members. Advisors match the rushee preferences with those of the chapters and create a pledge class for each sorority. Women who do not receive a bid are informed by their Rho Chis, and accepted women attend a party with their new sisters. The size of the pledge classes vary according to quota and the success of each sorority's recruitment efforts, but 30 new members is an average goal.

By the conclusion of sorority Rush in January of 1995, 51% of the women who had registered to participate had dropped out. While the failure to place some rushees is expected, the small size of the pledge classes (approximately 24 new members) alerted

³The following description is a simplified explanation of the process.

⁴For example, the schedule of the week in 1993 and 1994 was 7 parties Sunday, 6 Monday, 5 Wednesday, 4 Friday, and 3 Saturday.

the Panhellenic community to a problem with the system--decreased interest in Greek life resulting from dissatisfaction with recruitment practices. The rush results of the previous year (1994) were not as dramatic, but also indicated a decline in participation; some organizations had difficulty meeting quota, even though it was smaller than the 1993 figure. As Mary Guy asserts in From Organizational Decline To Organizational Renewal, "Decline will be stopped not when it is first noticed by someone, but when it is noticed by enough people to create the enthusiasm and commitment to initiate a renewal strategy" (Guy 152). Because the severe withdrawal rate affected all chapters in the system, Panhellenic leaders were encouraged to propose a mandate for change.

Exit surveys indicated that rushees viewed the selection process as a popularity contest based on superficial factors (e.g., fashion aptitude). They did not understand what criteria were used to judge them and determine releases. Furthermore, the structure of the week--7 parties on the first night, 7 on the second, 5 on the third, 4 on the fourth, 3 on the fifth, and 2 the last day--resulted in the release of large numbers of women after the second round. The sororities had to narrow the field, but the early timing shocked rushees. They did not feel as though they had been provided an opportunity to make an impression. Those who were invited back to organizations did not have enough of an understanding of the purpose and goals of the chapters to make informed choices. Reasons for withdrawing from Rush ranged from a decision that they did not want to participate in the Greek system to not being invited back to a specific organization.

The Rush problems focused negative attention on the Greek system. Brandy Singleton, an independent student who served as a freshman Resident Assistant, stated in a letter to the Collegian:

At a university where we preserve a coordinate system for the sake of promoting leadership opportunities and self-esteem for women, where sororities themselves sponsor speakers to address issues such as body image and self-esteem, I find the sorority Rush process to be a gross

affront. . . . I sincerely hope that the low numbers in this year's pledge classes will send a message to Panhellenic. It's time to reevaluate Rush regulations and the whole Rush process. (7)

Sororities were accused of damaging the self-esteem of those who did not match certain specifications by denying them membership. Furthermore, the Greek system was criticized for being a group of exclusive social organizations without a legitimate purpose.

In an effort to address the concerns of the individual chapters, a Rush Summit was held on February 5, 1995 (Appendix B). There was no set agenda; the purpose was to obtain feedback about the rush process and Greek life from sorority members. Surveys had been used to collect opinions from rushees. Officer transition in the sorority system occurs after the Rush period. Outgoing leaders related their experiences at the meeting; new officers learned of the challenge ahead and provided ideas for change. Advisors, presidents, rush chairs, and other interested officers from each of the seven chapters attended. The participants determined that intersorority competition, an absence of unified Panhellenic spirit, permeated the system. Solutions were proposed in several areas, but the primary concern was Rush. The chapters agreed (in theory) that more of an emphasis needed to be placed on the benefits of joining the system ("going Greek") instead of becoming a member of a particular chapter. Survival of the organizations required a paradigm shift in rush practices--a transition from rivalry to cooperation; from skit productions to quality conversations. The revision of Rush became the defining project of the 1995 Panhellenic Council; the executive members discussed this change process in personal interviews.

Implementation

The Rush Summit encouraged sorority members to reevaluate the purpose of Greek life. Although the social aspect is an important component of these organizations, sorority leaders also identified philanthropy, history, leadership, woman's issues,

scholarship, campus involvement, personal growth, sisterhood, friendship, and alumnae connections as important factors (Summit). However, rushee reactions demonstrated that Rush was not accomplishing its purpose of communicating these values to potential members. For many new students, the social emphasis evident in Rush did not alone justify the membership and financial commitments required by the organizations. Individuals commented that they did not need to pay for friends. Panhellenic Exec's new vision for Rush addressed these perceptions.

According to 1995 Panhellenic President Beth Dorsey, the primary goal for Rush 1996 was to place more women in the Greek system. Developed from the concerns expressed at the summit, the guiding vision was a return to the original ideals of the sororities. Beth views the revision of Rush as only the first step in the redefinition of the Greek system.

Rush was an important target for change because of the reciprocal relationship between recruitment practices and expectations of the system. Furthermore, Rush is intended to serve as a natural renewal process, replacing graduating members with new sisters to continue the organization. Strange reasons:

Perhaps a review of images and dominant features communicated by the Greek system during the "rush" process is a starting point. In effect, these features and images indirectly influence the values of prospective members even before they join the specific organizations. That influence needs to be examined carefully if a change in membership is to be effected. (521)

Ideally, Rush provides participants with a representative view of each chapter: the organization's purpose and activities. The reliance on skits and decorations to sell the Greek system demonstrated the social focus of the sororities. Other aspects of membership--leadership and service opportunities, for example--were not highlighted. Therefore, the campus community did not realize these issues were important to Greeks; rushees did not view these opportunities as an incentive to join the system and

eventually their importance in some chapters diminished. This cycle of decreased expectations, with an increased emphasis on social opportunities, resulted in a self-fulfilling prophecy; social entertainment became the defining purpose of the Greek system. The original objective of providing a balance of experiences for college students in a supportive environment was sacrificed because Rush parties omitted many of the sororities' ideals; members no longer identified educational, cultural, and service activities as essential to their organizations.

In summary, Rush was a visible problem Panhellenic leaders could address to immediately alter expectations of the Greek organizations. To successfully challenge the rush process, Panhellenic leaders had to establish a commitment to the change process at different levels of the system. Beth and the VP Rush Carol Papenhausen were aware of the need for change before they transitioned into their Panhellenic positions. They had served as Rho Chis and personally witnessed the problems between sororities during Rush 1995 and the disillusionment of participants. The Rush Summit was then used as a catalyst for action. Others in the system were confronted with the reality of the Rush decline and urged to design a renewal strategy. Concerns expressed during Rush and the summit evolved into a realization that change had to be enacted.

Panhellenic Exec did not impose their vision on the system; they inspired a shared vision by involving the chapters in the solution process. To change the misconceptions produced by the traditional methods of rush, the format and focus of the week had to be changed. More information had to be provided to the rushees about the sororities' activities. Panhellenic intended to improve the image of the system and renew the organizations' basic purpose by challenging the way the sororities marketed themselves. The social image was no longer encouraging membership. Sisters had to reevaluate what sorority was giving them and then communicate these reasons for joining. Panhellenic reiterated a simple message to promote a commitment to change: focus on the reasons for sisterhood, the people, and reflect this purpose through rush practices.

However, some groups did not want change. The organizations are steeped in traditions. Many had a history of skit success and were attached to the social formula of Rush. It was difficult for them to focus on the big picture and visualize a more basic process; they were nervous about the reactions of their members and potential sisters to a change in format. There was no guarantee that the risks taken would translate into improvements in participation. Many concentrated on what a change in focus meant for their chapters and did not consider the implications for the system.

To gain commitment to a new vision, Nanus suggests "discussing the vision with them [the people involved] in terms that address their own legitimate concerns and interests" (135). The leader's objective is to encourage people to voluntarily participate in a change. Nanus provides a formula:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Vision} + \text{Communication} = \text{Shared Purpose} \\ &\text{Shared Purpose} + \text{Empowered People} + \\ &\text{Appropriate Organizational Changes} + \text{Strategic Thinking} = \\ &\text{Successful Visionary Leadership (156)} \end{aligned}$$

People are content with the status quo as long as it supports their self-interest. O'Toole argues, "Change may be good for others or even for the system as a whole, but unless it is specifically good for us, we will resist it" (161). Panhellenic Exec knew the chapters were concerned about Rush performance. Therefore, they discussed their vision for a return to the basics in terms of Rush. They convinced others in the system that the accepted rush practices were not accurately representing the purpose of the organizations.

Furthermore, the Panhellenic leaders discussed the interdependence of the chapters. Some sororities had not experienced as much of a decline as others; the skit method was still effective for them. However, they needed to realize that decline in parts of the system would eventually affect their performance. The traditional presentations would cease to work because they did not communicate the values the new rushees

sought. Based on discussions at the summit, a plan was developed for a "no frills" Rush. The sisters and the various activities they participated in through the Greek system were the focus of this proposed idea. Conversations and educational presentations were supposed to be the concentration instead of decorations and stage productions. The measure passed by a vote of four chapters to three.

According to O'Toole, the established leaders of organizations are often the most resistant to the efforts of a change agent. The new sorority officers had certain expectations of their positions. They were comfortable with the accepted ways of the system. According to O'Toole, a change leader "must be able to show that the proposed change is a necessary step toward progress *as defined by the haves* (254). The presidents and rush chairs eventually understood the reasons behind the proposed change effort. After all, they had been the ones to discuss the limitations of the previous system at the summit. However, as indicated by the vote, some chapters objected to the selected method for renewal or the extent of the revision. Dalziel and Schoonover claim, "Change leadership is about harnessing and controlling the potential chaos and distress that comes with change" (25). After members realized the need for change and agreed to the vision, exec had to elicit cooperation for the actual process.

As Beth Dorsey explained, the process they used can be applied to all organizations. Panhellenic encouraged constant input and evaluation from all levels. The parameters for the change were the responsibility of the leaders, but the detail were developed by the sorority officers. According to Alison Bartel-Lord, Director for Greek Life, the transition to a more representative Rush required the direction of the executive board. Rush chairs focused on the design of their chapters' presentation. The leaders had to understand the overall implications of the change to ensure the developed plans would accomplish the objective.

The Panhellenic leaders claim they did not have a structured strategy because the change process became so much bigger than they originally anticipated. Panhellenic

offices are transient positions. The previous Greek leaders and Alison Bartel-Lord provided the new exec with the initial change concept--they organized the Rush Summit. The new officers then began to implement the ideas produced by involving others in the vision and the planning process. Although support for a basic rush was divided, all of the organizations were bound by the vote once the decision was made.

Panhellenic leaders enabled others to act by involving them in each step of the process. Weekly meetings with president and rush chairs gave the chapter ownership over the design as their representatives developed the new idea of informative presentations. Each night of Rush focused on a different benefit of Greek membership--the education program, community service, alumnae connections. Philanthropy Night epitomized the new focus (Appendices B and C). Elizabeth Crowe, VP Publicity/Community Service, worked with the service chairs from each chapter to structure the concept of an interactive Rush party. Sisters and rushees cooperated to finish a project for each chapter's philanthropy. The activity provided the opportunity to concentrate on meaningful conversation about the chapters' programs and sisters' individual interests. Surveys done by a NPC consulting team during the week demonstrate the positive effect this format had on rushee perceptions (Appendix D). They learned more about the chapters and the benefits of membership in a relaxed atmosphere.

Panhellenic modeled the way by providing the parameters for change. The chapters were required to cooperate to design the specific revisions of each Rush party. The leaders identified the effort as a collaborative process. Beth was the formal leader because of her position and her ability to integrate various ideas into a vision for the future. The VP Rush, Carol, was more of a transactional leader, working with the rush chairs to create the actual structure of each night. Others on the board functioned in different roles as required. Elizabeth Crowe emerged as the objective member, playing devil's advocate to balance the board's ideas. As Alison Bartel-Lord explained, exec

communicated the vision and the rush chairs provided the ideas to achieve the goal of a simplified Rush. Panhellenic leaders were also responsible for encouraging each other and the chapters when people doubted the change.

Results

The NPC consulting team reported that the “Panhellenic officers expressed a desire to educate the new freshman and transfers about the sorority experience” and worked “cooperatively to find solutions for problems” (Report 5). The result after Rush 1996 was an increase in sorority membership (49 more spaces were created) and a new respect for the Greek system. Brandy Singleton, the same student who had objected to the rush process the previous year, wrote a letter to the Collegian in February 1996 stating:

The women in charge of Rush this year have, in my opinion, justified the existence of a sorority system on this campus. . . . If these are the types of women that have come up through the sorority system and learned leadership skills within that system, then the system obviously has some very positive aspects. As with every year, there are women who did not make it through the Rush process. The difference this year was that women had more of an opportunity to see for themselves, and decide for themselves, whether or not being in a sorority was the path for them.

The NPC concluded, “The Panhellenic incorporated a no frills rush with new rush themes which reflected the meaning of sorority life on the University of Richmond campus. The philanthropy round and sisterhood round are outstanding and should be shared as model rush programs” (Report 7). The 1995 Panhellenic Executive Council recently presented their program to a national conference of College Panhellenics. They shared their ideas and their leadership experiences.

The Panhellenic leaders cite the increase in membership and the focus on philanthropic activities as evidence of the success of their change effort. The social

aspect of Greek organizations was placed in perspective as other activities were emphasized. The new sisters now have certain expectations about what sorority membership provides; sorority leaders are now accountable for providing a variety of programming in their chapters.

Communication and empowerment were the methods used to develop the revised Rush; sorority officers collaborated with Panhellenic to design changes. However, many chapter members were not convinced of the idea of a basic Rush until they viewed the success of the strategy. Panhellenic leaders endured constant criticism but were convinced of their vision. They believe improvements in communication between sorority leaders and their chapters might have produced a more positive and unified commitment of all members.

The Rush revision successfully altered expectations of the sorority system. However, the new Panhellenic is developing further changes to complete the return to the basic values of the organizations. The emphasis on a simplified Rush was the first step and provided a foundation for renewal.

CONCLUSION

If we do not change our direction, we are likely to end up where we are headed.
Ancient Chinese Proverb

Organizational renewal progresses through phases--commitment to change, a period of strategy and consensus building, the implementation of activities designed to create positive results, and the permanent establishment of new routines (Guy 155). The 1995 Rush Revision was one component of Panhellenic's vision of renewal through a return to the legitimate purposes of the Greek system. Change was achieved through the collaboration of the officers in the system. Although Panhellenic encountered resistance, their communication and leadership practices enabled followers to develop a more representative Rush and alter perceptions of their system.

Works Cited

- Abrahamowicz, Daniel. "College Involvement, Perceptions, and Satisfaction: A Study of Membership in Student Organizations." Journal of College Student Development 29 (1988): 233-238.
- Astin, Alexander W. Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.
- Ackerman, Robert. "The Survival of Greek Life: Concerns and Solutions." NASPA Journal 28 (1990): 78-81.
- Atlas, Gordon, and Dean Morier. "The Sorority Rush Process: Self-Selection, Acceptance Criteria, and the Effect of Rejection." Journal of College Student Development 35 (1994): 346-353.
- Baier, John L., and Edward G. Whipple. "Greek Values and Attitudes: A Comparison with Independents." NASPA Journal 28 (1990): 43-53.
- Bartel-Lord, Alison. Personal Interview. April 1996.
- Beeland, Kelly. Personal Interview. April 1996.
- Cole, Stephen. The Sociological method: An Introduction to the Science of Sociology. 3rd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Company, 1980.
- Cooper, Diane L., Margaret A. Healy, and Jacqueline Simpson. "Student Development Through Involvement: Specific Changes Over Time." Journal of College Student Development 35 (1994): 98-102.
- Crowe, Elizabeth. Personal Interview. April 1996.
- Dalziel, Murray M., and Stephen C. Schoonover. Changing Ways: A Practical Tool for Implementing Change Within Organizations. New York: American Management Association, 1988.
- Dorsey, Beth. Personal Interview. April 1996.
- Ellis, David. "Does Greek Life Belong? Two Roads To Community: Setting New Goals for the Greek System." Educational Record 70.3-4 (1989): 48-53.

- Guy, Mary E. From Organizational Decline To Organizational Renewal: The Phoenix Syndrome. Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books, 1989.
- Hunt, Stephen, and Audrey L. Rentz. "Greek-letter Social Group Members' Involvement and Psychosocial Development." Journal of College Student Development 35 (1994): 289-295.
- Keller, Michael J., and Derrell Hart. "The Effects of Sorority and Fraternity Rush On Students' Self-Images." Journal of College Student Personnel 23 (1982): 257-261.
- Komives, Susan R. "Women Student Leaders: Self-perceptions of Empowering Leadership and Achieving Style." NASPA Journal 31 (1994): 102-112.
- Kouzes, J. M. and Barry Z. Posner. The Leadership Challenge: How To Get Extraordinary Things Done In Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.
- Krysinski, Patricia R., and Donald B. Reed. "Organizational Change and Change Leadership." The Journal of Leadership Studies 1.2 (1994): 65-72.
- Lippitt, Gordon L. Organizational Renewal. New York: Meredith Corporation, 1969.
- Nanus, Burt. Visionary Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992.
- National Panhellenic Conference. "Resolutions Adopted at the 1991 Biennial Conference."
- National Panhellenic Conference. "Report of the National Panhellenic Conference Consulting Team." University of Richmond: 1996.
- O'Toole, James. Leading Change: Overcoming the Ideology of Comfort and the Tyranny of Custom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995.
- Papenhausen, Carol. Personal Interview. April 1996.
- Pike, Gary R., and Jerry W. Askew. "The Impact of Fraternity or Sorority Membership on Academic Involvement and Learning Outcomes." NASPA Journal 28 (1990): 13-18.

- Posner, Barry Z., and Barbara Brodsky. "Leadership Practices of Effective Student Leaders: Gender Makes No Difference." NASPA Journal 31 (1994): 113-120.
- Scott, Jeanne. "Are We Really Who We Think/Say We Are?" University of Richmond Panhellenic System. Richmond, 26 Feb. 1996.
- Singleton, Brandy. Letter. The Collegian 26 January 1995: 7.
- . Letter. The Collegian 8 February 1996: original copy.
- Stoner-Zemel, Jesse. "Realizing Your Vision." Executive Excellence (1990): 16-17.
- Strange, Carney. "Greek Affiliation and Goals of the Academy: A Commentary." Journal of College Student Personnel 27 (1986): 519-523.
- Villani, Sara. Personal Interview. April 1996.

Appendix

Project Documents:

- National Panhellenic Conference Resolutions
- 1995 Rush Exit Comments
- Rush Summit Results Outline
- 1995 University of Richmond Panhellenic Council minutes
- Personal notes from 1995 President and Rush Meetings
- Report of the National Panhellenic Conference Consulting Team (1996)

Interview Topic Questions:

- Did you realize rush was going to be an issue when you ran for Panhellenic office?
- Who originated the idea for changing Rush?
- What was Panhellenic Executive Council's vision for the Rush change?
- Did Panhellenic have a strategy for change?
- What were the obstacles to change?
- What do you identify as the success of the Rush change?
- How would you improve the process in retrospect?
- Was there one change leader; was the change a collaborative process?
- Would you describe the process as an imposed change or a participative change?
- What were the different leadership roles and styles of the executive officers?
- Implications for the future of the system?
- Other comments?

RUSH SUMMIT

February 5, 1995

CONCERNS:

- * lack of communication within chapters regarding each other and Panhellenic
- * competition between sororities and negative affects on sororities
- * normal social contact does not exist as we know it to be defined
- * high number of withdraws---could we modify the system?
- * more invitational even though commitment to lower invitational feeling
- * rumors and backstabbing!
- * lack of communication within chapters
- * sisters discussing other chapter situations with rushees
- * judicial situations not public
- * betrayed trust of PH exec regarding group decisions that weren't followed
- * invitational feeling is not good for chapters
- * best friends hurting each other
- * development of personalities of chapters
- * chapter officers "oking" violations
- * chapter did not support rush rules and guidelines
- * rushees being misled through pref
- * must improve on informality
- * too much talk = to negative affect on system and chapters

- * PXs "in the dark" with regards to judicial situations
- * "hotboxing" and then releasing women
- * lack of time to talk in parties
- * PXs feel like hypocrites because rushees' uniformed decisions
- * required to release too many women before getting to know them
- * pre-determined destination
- * rush rule education
- * chapter attitude towards PH and Rush
- * pref should show support to be Greek instead of one chapter
- * high amount of single preferencing
- * spirit of Panhellenic is waning
- * lack of education regarding system

SOLUTIONS:

CHAPTER/PH EDUCATION:

- * non-alcoholic, intersorority programming---sell Greek system
- * use of PH delegates with rush chairs and party chairs for presentation
- * involving members as well as officers
- * perception of PH
- * interactive presentations
- * use of sophomores to do skits for chapters

PRE-RUSH:

- * more informal events in the fall (3 or 4)

- * Greek interest groups (less intimidation)
- * Greek walk-around at the fraternity lodges (Oct.?)
- * all Ph picnic with rushees
- * PXs going to OC groups
- * events starting in Sept., 1/month
- * active, casual interaction
- * central location (i.e. Westhampton Green, Boatwright Library)
- * informational tables with 3 sisters
- * "Welcome to UR" sponsored by sorority system involving all women
- * third event rush oriented (i.e. requirement for Rush)
- * how do we get them to events? interest groups, OCs, mandatory for Rush
- * more educated rushees = less withdraws
- * interactive session with rushees regarding rush rules

JUDICIAL/RUSH RULES:

- * support of chapter officers
- * presentation of rules by those affected (PXs, Exec, not just Rush chairs)
- * more insight about why the rush rules are important
- * real stories by PXs
- * general involved members speaking with other chapters
- * comments of rushees told to chapters
- * presentation to all 7 chapters (get same info) with members from each chapter speaking
- * use of internal discipline (unacceptable behavior in chapters)

- * skits
- * informal programming 1st semester
- * less superficiality
- * stronger Panhellenic spirit
- * chapter/system education

FORMAL RUSH:

- * less emphasis on making an impression with clothes (change attitudes)
- * more casual clothes
- * longer rush (less releases per night)
- * community service night (hands on project)
- * stress on social aspect needs to be limited
- * emphasis on going Greek
- * "Go Greek Day" (UR Rush t-shirts for sisters and rushees)
- * breaking up parties (3 one night, 4 the other)---concern with prejudgments

WHAT IS A SORORITY (besides the social aspect)?

- | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| * philanthropy | * scholarship | * sisterhood |
| * history | * campus involvement | * friendship |
| * leadership | * personal growth | *life long/alum |
| * woman's issues | | |

SUGGESTED RUSH SCHEDULE:

<u>FRIDAY</u>	<u>SATURDAY</u>	<u>SUNDAY</u> 7
parties	7 parties	6 parties
30 min.	30 min.	45 min.
UR/sorority	scholarship	philanthropy
history	woman's issues	activity
slides	finances	
<u>MONDAY</u>	<u>TUESDAY</u>	<u>WEDNESDAY</u>
night off	4 parties	night off
	40 min.	
	campus involv.	
	leadership	
	skit	
<u>THURSDAY</u>	<u>FRIDAY</u>	<u>SATURDAY</u>
night off	3 parties	2 parties
	45 min.	60 min.
	sisterhood,	Pref night
	personal growth,	
	alum., ritual	

The following information is what I believe to be our agreements from last semester.

DAY 1: FRIDAY, January 19, 1996 GO GREEK 7 X 30 min

- * 60 slides
- * no cups in slides, no men in letters unless for philan event
- * presentation (look like general sis, theme but be self, no transition songs)
- * 1 entrance and 1 exit song
- * dress is casual (i.e jeans, khakis, shorts)
- * no tables may be used (including those in rooms already)
- * 30 balloons and 6 ft X 9 ft banner with name
- * may have composite (remember to cover PXs)

DAY 2: SATURDAY, January 20, 1996 NEW MEM/PLEDGE PROGRAM 7 X 30 min

- * presentation
- * 7 min
- * max 5 people (exclude rush chair and president)
- * 1 entrance and 1 exit song
- * dress is casual

DAY 3: SUNDAY, January 21, 1996 PHILANTHROPY NIGHT 6 X 45 min

- * agreements of community service chairs

DAY 4: TUESDAY, January 23, 1996 CAMPUS INVOLVEMENT 4 X 40 min

- * skit (costumes, acting, transition songs)
- * 12 minutes (time begins with first person speaking)
- * no limit on number of people involved
- * casual dress
- * 1 entrance and 1 exit song

DAY 5: FRIDAY, January 26, 1996 SISTERHOOD NIGHT 3 X 45 min

- * skit
- * 1 entrance and 1 exit song
- * 3 alumnae per party in room (excluding 1 advisor) and may rotate
- * 10 min
- * must be scripted
- * class clothes

DAY 6: SATURDAY, January 27, 1996 PREF NIGHT 2 X 60 min

- * remember no pref letters

February 6, 1996

1996 WOMEN'S FRATERNITY FORMAL RUSH STATISTICS

The 1996 Women's Fraternity Formal Rush was held January 19 - 28, 1996. The following is a summary of the Rush activities:

1362	Total Women's Enrollment
401	Total Women's First Year Enrollment
519	Total Women in the Women's Greek Life System*
346	# of Women Registered for Rush
	First Year 286 (71% of 1995-96 class)
	Sophomores 59
	Juniors 1
	Senior 0
	(Transfers 2 - included in the sophomore statistics)
204	# of Women Who Pledged/Associated a Women's Fraternity (59% of those persons registered for Rush)
	First Year 175 (44% of 1995-96 first year) (61% of first year class registered for Rush)
	Sophomores 29
	Juniors 0
	Senior 0
	Number of Women Who Did NOT Receive and/ or Accept a Bid (0% of those persons registered for Rush)
	First year students 0
	Sophomores 0
	Juniors 0
	Seniors 0
142	# of women who withdrew/explanations (41% of those persons registered for Rush)
	First year students 111 (39% of those reg. For Rush)
	Sophomores 30 (51% of those reg. For Rush)
	Juniors 1
	Seniors 0
29	Avg. New Member class size (Quota/ 1st year = 31; Upperclass = 5)
519	Active Sisterhood membership* (54% of upperclass 1995-96 enrollment)
723	1995-96 womens' fraternity membership** (53% of 1995-96 women's enrollment)

* Includes only those women who have been initiated

** Includes women who have been initiated and new members

RUSH EVALUATION RESULTS

January 19, 1996

“Go Greek Night”

Questions:

1. Do you feel that you now have a better understanding of the Greek system in general as well as an introduction to individual chapters?
2. Do you feel that you learned more about the chapters through your conversations with the sisters?
3. In the parties, I was:

	1	2	3	4	5
#1	5	14	2	137	106
#2	8	46	7	126	77

	overwhelm	comfy	nervous	prepared	excited	bored	other
#3	64	216	67	60	145	28	18

Total Sample Size: 264

RUSH EVALUATION RESULTS

January 20, 1996

“Pledge Program Night”

Questions:

1. As a result of these events, do you feel that you understand what the goals of the pledge period are, as well as your responsibility as a member?
2. Do you feel that you now have an understanding of the different aspects (such as scholarship philanthropy, member development, finances, and social) incorporated in sorority life?
3. In the parties, I was: (circle all that apply)

	(1=not at all)		(5=very much so)		
	1	2	3	4	5
#1		10	3	157	98
#2		23	4	158	83

	overwhelm	comfy	nervous	prepared	excited	bored	other
#3	14	252	19	94	143	29	11

RUSH EVALUATION RESULTS

January 21, 1996

“Philanthropy Night”

Questions:

1. Did you learn about the chapters' local and national philanthropy (both in the presentation and conversation)?
2. Did you enjoy the philanthropy activities?
3. Did you feel there was enough time for the planned activities?
4. Please Comment: Do you feel the activities related well to the overall community service goals of the chapter? Were they worth doing? Did you have fun?

	(1=not at all)			(5=very much so)	
	1	2	3	4	5
#1		1		51	158
#2				36	174
#3		3	1	61	145

Total Sample Size: 210

Comments (Question #4):

- ◆ YES! YES! YES!
- ◆ Very good idea, breaks the ice and is lots of fun!
- ◆ I had a really good time today, but I think its important for the PX's to know how cuts are made.
- ◆ Definitely. They were fun and it was cool that the sororities could actually use them to help their philanthropy.
- ◆ Yes, I had a great time and I really learned a lot about their philanthropies.
- ◆ Yes--they were very worthwhile and relaxing.
- ◆ Yes, but next time they should be a little more varied.
- ◆ I thought it was the best so far. The conversation was much more comfortable.
- ◆ They were definitely fun and worthwhile. But I was unable to talk to as many people.
- ◆ Yes, good, much fun.
- ◆ I had a lot of fun and I learned a lot more about the philanthropy than I think I otherwise would have.
- ◆ Yes, the activities resulted in something for their philanthropies. The activities were a lot of fun.
- ◆ Yes--very good--nice environment! I like jeans!
- ◆ Yes, definitely worth doing, and fun.
- ◆ For the most part, they related well to the service goals. They were fun and worth doing.
- ◆ I felt the activities were an interesting way of getting people involved. The activities also made the conversations move away from the usual chit-chat.
- ◆ It was much better than expected and the casual attire was great.
- ◆ Yes they were very worthwhile and I'm glad that the sororities are using our projects to help the community.
- ◆ They were a lot of fun and definitely worth doing.
- ◆ The activities were so much fun. I loved it!!!

I enjoyed the activities. They helped people relax.

Yes-fun-interesting! Good change!!!!

Yes. I felt that they were very worth doing because it made me feel active in the chapter. I had a lot of fun.

I had a great deal of fun. The activities were definitely related to the service goals of the chapters.

They were worth doing.

This was definitely the best night. We got to meet sisters and feel much more comfortable. It was a lot more relaxed and fun.

- ◆ Yes, they were good because we were able to actually help plus meet people.
- ◆ Had most fun today--very tired though.
- ◆ The best night so far, much more comfortable with casual wear and doing things.
- ◆ Yes it was very much worth doing it was a lot of fun.
- ◆ Yes, good idea and it was fun.
- ◆ Yes, because you learned that the sororities do more than party and it was less superficial today.
- ◆ It was a lot of fun and a great way to meet people in a more relaxed setting.
- ◆ It was a great way to meet more sisters. Very relaxed!
- ◆ I thought it was wonderful. Do it again next year.
- ◆ I had fun.
- ◆ Definitely worth doing...feel like doing something instead of wasting time.
- ◆ It was definitely a great way to spend out time during the visiting. It gave us a chance to do something in addition to talking.

It was worth while and will make an impact on those it will help.

I think today's activities were lots of fun and a great success.

I think they were worth it because I learned exactly what they (chapters) do. I had a ton of fun.

They related very well, worth doing, and lots of fun. I felt really informed.

The activities were definitely appropriate to the service goals. They were worthwhile and I had a lot of fun.

The activities made this day really good--it was fun and you got to know people better.

The activities were great. I had fun and got to talk with the sisters.

This was the best day of rush so far. I love having to DO things instead of just talking.

The activities did relate well to the community service activities. There were definitely worth doing.

Even if I don't join a sorority, I'm glad that the events benefited people. I had fun.

So far, this was the best day--especially the jeans.

Yes, they were well related. It was an interesting and fun way to incorporate education about the sorority.

I had a really fun time and it gave me a chance to interact with the girls on a different level.

Yes, the activities were definitely worth doing. They allowed all the women to relax and talk. I had a good time at most, but a very bad experience at one. Unfortunately, the two sisters were good friends with the other rushee and practically ignored me for most of the time.

- ◆ Yes, they were very informative, I loved it!!!!
- ◆ Had a great time!!! Learned a lot.
- ◆ Yes they really explained what the events of philanthropy are really about. It was the most fun day.
- ◆ Yes, the activities were very related to their chapter. I had fun.
- ◆ Today's activities made it a lot easier to get along with conversations.
- ◆ Had a very good time today.
- ◆ It was excellent to help the community.
- ◆ Yes, it also created a more relaxed environment to talk to the different sororities.
- ◆ Some of the activities, especially those requiring adequate creative talent, were less fun than others.
- ◆ Yes, they were so much fun to do. I think that we should have done them during the second night of rush so we could all participate in all the sororities fun activities. They were really fun.

Yes, they were very well explained. I had a lot of fun because it helped me a lot to meet people.

Yes, they were very helpful, I feel, to help the philanthropy and I feel that they are very worth doing.

- ◆ Yes, they seemed like worthwhile projects and I had a blast.
- ◆ This day was the most fun--was more relaxed and casual.
- ◆ Yes, it was fun and worth doing.
- ◆ I thought all the activities were really great ideas and lots of fun.
- ◆ Oh Yes! They were a lot of fun, and they related well to the philanthropy of each sorority. I had a lot of fun.

I had so much fun. It was more laid back and relaxing. I loved wearing comfy clothes!! I felt more myself.

- ◆ They were fun and definitely worth doing.
- ◆ They were awesome.
- ◆ Fun. Relaxed. Interesting--able to sit back and be myself.
- ◆ In addition, they provided a more "real" event to converse with the sororities.
- ◆ They were definitely worth doing and they were a lot of fun.
- ◆ Worth doing. Definitely had fun!
- ◆ This was the most fun night--relaxed and something to take the "pressure/stress" off.
- ◆ Today was the best day so far and the crafts made conversations easier.
- ◆ Today was so much fun in comparison with the last two. The atmosphere was much more relaxed, and each activity had an actual purpose. It was easier to be yourself.

The activities were very fun and they provided us with an opportunity to get to know the sorority members on a casual level.

It made a much more relaxed atmosphere in which we could interact on a more personal basis because we all had a goal in mind. It was great to have something in my hand when I talked to others.

Limit time by five minutes.

I felt the activities were very charitable and beneficial to their philanthropies. Definitely worth doing and much fun.

- ◆ They helped me get an understanding of each philanthropy. I had a lot of fun.
- ◆ It was much better than just talking.
- ◆ It was the best day--very casual and comfortable.
- ◆ This was the best night so far. The activities were fun and gave us an opportunities to bond with the sisters.
- ◆ This was fun, this should be instead of the second day of 7.
- ◆ Tonight was the best night and I had so much fun.
- ◆ Yes, but instead of releasing only one sorority the first time, you should release two because then the day wouldn't seem so long.

This day was a great experience. It was so much easier to get to know the sisters in a more relaxed atmosphere (both with the casual dress and the activities).

- ◆ Loved wearing jeans! More comfortable.
- ◆ They were great!
- ◆ I learned a lot and had fun doing it.
- ◆ It gave us an excellent opportunity to work together.
- ◆ worthwhile--I was very comfortable.
- ◆ Yes, absolutely! They were fun, I learned a lot, and it was easy to talk with the sisters in a more relaxed environment.
- ◆ I enjoyed this day's activities the most.
- ◆ It was much different than the other nights. I felt more comfortable.
- ◆ Now I will remember each sorority's philanthropy. I also enjoyed them, they were worthwhile.
- ◆ I enjoyed the day. I felt it was worth doing and a nice change of pace.
- ◆ I will remember the philanthropy of each chapter more clearly as a result of the activities.
- ◆ They were really fun.
- ◆ This was a very good idea.
- ◆ All the activities were fun and all had a good purpose.
- ◆ The activities were a lot of fun and they were definitely worth doing.

- ◆ The activities were lots of fun and definitely worth doing. It was great to see the philanthropy of the sororities in This day was a great experience. It was so much easier to get to know the sisters in a more relaxed atmosphere (both with the casual dress and the activities).
- ◆ Loved wearing jeans! More comfortable.
- ◆ They were great!
- ◆ I learned a lot and had fun doing it.
- ◆ It gave us an excellent opportunity to work together.
- ◆ worthwhile--I was very comfortable.
- ◆ Yes, absolutely! They were fun, I learned a lot, and it was easy to talk with the sisters in a more relaxed environment.
- ◆ I enjoyed this day's activities the most.
- ◆ It was much different than the other nights. I felt more comfortable.
- ◆ Now I will remember each sorority's philanthropy. I also enjoyed them, they were worthwhile.
- ◆ I enjoyed the day. I felt it was worth doing and a nice change of pace.
- ◆ I will remember the philanthropy of each chapter more clearly as a result of the activities.
- ◆ They were really fun.
- ◆ This was a very good idea.
- ◆ All the activities were fun and all had a good purpose.
- ◆ The activities were a lot of fun and they were definitely worth doing.
- ◆ The activities were lots of fun and definitely worth doing. It was great to see the philanthropy of the sororities in ACTION!
- ◆ Today was a real good day. The best day so far. Lots of fun.
- ◆ I had lots of fun--this day was definitely worth while.
- ◆ This was definitely the best day so far.
- ◆ They were really great and it allowed us to get some one on one talking in.
- ◆ I had a great time! It was a good break.
- ◆ Lots of fun. Great relaxer. Definitely do it next year. Good interaction.
- ◆ I liked today a lot because it was so laid-back and casual. The activities were fun and helped me remember about each philanthropy.
- ◆ The best day!
- ◆ I had a great time and I think that they are very worthwhile and I was very impressed with the creativity.
- ◆ They were fun and useful
- ◆ Today was so much fun. I enjoyed working with the sorority women. The projects made for easy conversation.
- ◆ They were worth doing! and a lot of fun!! I had a great time today!!!
- ◆ I had sooooo much fun! They were well worth it and the atmosphere was much more relaxed and fun.
- ◆ I think this is the best night so far. It was really fun and worth doing.
- ◆ It was a great day!!
- ◆ I learned a lot about community service and had a lot of fun in the process.
- ◆ This was the greatest night so far!! I learned so much and met lots of people while doing a worthwhile activity.
- ◆ It was very relaxed and comfortable.
- ◆ Yes they were worth doing. They were all fun and a great casual way to meet the sisters.
- ◆ I had a great time.
- ◆ Great ideas!!! I like having a casual day.
- ◆ Time well spent -- productive and more relaxed. It makes philanthropy a very apparent important factor of being in a sorority.
- ◆ This day was my favorite--great idea.
- ◆ I felt so much more at ease wearing jeans and actually having something to do.
- ◆ I had a lot of fun.
- ◆ Definitely worth doing!! They made things a lot less stressful.
- ◆ I liked today's events a lot. They gave us a better opportunity to get to know people.

- ◆ The activities were a great way of learning more about the chapters philanthropies.
- ◆ I was not as bored today!
- ◆ This was a great day. More informal, more comfortable. Loved it!
- ◆ Philanthropy day gave rushees a better way to talk with the sisters. The activities were really fun and gave us a better idea of what the sorority is like.
- ◆ They were a lot of fun and were very worth doing.
- ◆ I loved working with the sisters. I had a great day. It was the best day so far.
- ◆ Today was a lot of fun, more relaxed and laid back.
- ◆ They went to a good cause and rush was a lot less stressful today. It was very enjoyable.
- ◆ The goals were really good, it was fun and relaxing.
- ◆ Today was a more relaxing day. They were a lot of fun.
- ◆ I liked them. Today was fun. I think five parties would have been better instead of having to go to six.
- ◆ They made things more relaxed and comfortable and it gave you time to really get to sit and really talk and get to know the sisters well. although it would be good to have a little more time to meet other sisters that you didn't get to meet the nights before.
- ◆ I really enjoyed the activities!! I think they will help the causes and they did relate well to the service goals of the chapters.
- ◆ This was a fun and interesting way to get acquainted with the community service projects of each sorority.
- ◆ The casual atmosphere was great! It was easier to talk to people and be yourself while doing the activities.
- ◆ I thought today was the best of all the rush days so far. It was fun and relaxing. And we also helped people who needed it. I learned a lot too.
- ◆ I felt that the activities helped us understand what each group does for their philanthropy.
- ◆ They were planned well and were fun and interesting.
- ◆ It was a lot of fun--good to be more comfortable and relaxed.
- ◆ I think that the philanthropy night was a lot of fun. It also made conversation come a lot easier too.
- ◆ Activities were fun, even though we won't join all, we were able to help.
- ◆ They were really fun and it was relaxing to actually sit down.
- ◆ I had a great time at all 6 of the sororities! Great idea!
- ◆ I thought that it was a great idea. It was a good idea to learn about the different philanthropies.
- ◆ It gave me a lot of insight into what each chapter is all about. Its been my favorite night so far because you were doing something and because each philanthropy is different you didn't have to listen to the basic same old thing over and over again.
- ◆ I think that the activities helped to show how involved the sororities are in the community. The activities were fun and the setting was much more relaxed.
- ◆ The activities related well to the community service. I had a lot of fun doing the activities and I feel they were worth doing.
- ◆ The activities definitely were related to the philanthropy and worth doing. It was a lot of fun and the activity was more comfortable and helped stimulate topics for conversation.
- ◆ The activities today were a lot of fun. I enjoyed spending time getting to know all the sisters and seeing a little of what they do in the sorority.
- ◆ They gave you a chance to get to know the girls in depth so you could see if you fit in.
- ◆ The activities were awesome. Whoever thought of it needs to be congratulated!!
- ◆ It was good because you still met people and did work for the philanthropy of the sorority.
- ◆ I thought it was a good idea and fun.
- ◆ Today's activities were absolutely wonderful. Very worth while. And I had lots of fun.
- ◆ I really felt like I was doing something special for the community. It was definitely worth it and a good time.
- ◆ I think it was fun and worth the activity. It gave a "purpose" to the party.
- ◆ The activities were fun and took some pressure off.

- ◆ I think rush for women should begin a week before the spring semester starts. The work is just too new and overloading.
- ◆ The day was more relaxing and the activities made it easier to meet people.
- ◆ I don't see how we can not know how the sororities choose who they want. I feel we at least should know that!
- ◆ I had so much fun tonight. It was good to be able to wear blue jeans and do something helpful.
- ◆ Very worth doing. It made the atmosphere much more relaxed and conducive to conversation.
- ◆ It was more fun than just standing around and provided conversation.
- ◆ I think all the activities were well planned and a lot of fun.

RUSH EVALUATION RESULTS

January 23, 1996

“Campus Involvement”

Questions:

1. The skits in the chapters were not only entertaining, but also provided further insight into the chapters?
2. Conversations at these events focused on campus involvement and the chapter activities?
3. Did you feel comfortable asking questions?
4. Are your concerns being addressed without you having to verbalize them?

	(1=not at all)				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1		5	1	82	133
#2	11	56	7	99	48
#3		9	1	65	146
#4	1	18	4	112	85

Total Sample Size: 221

RUSH EVALUATION RESULTS

January 26, 1996
"Sisterhood Event"

Questions:

1. Did the alum presentations give you insight in to the Greek experience beyond college?
2. Were conversations more serious tonight than previously?

	(1=not at all)			(5=very much so)	
	1	2	3	4	5
#1			1	63	95
#2	2	16		67	74

Total Sample Size: 159

1996 Rush Comments:

Question #3 : What is your overall impression of this night in comparison to previous nights?

- I was really excited in seeing old faces and meeting new ones!
- It gave a different impression of Greek life-more serious
- It was the same
- I felt this night was great. This gave us a definite feeling of sisterhood
- good
- good
- This night gave me a good idea of what greek life means after graduation
- a better view of sororities in general
- It exposed me to another side of greek life
- you got to meet more sisters
- quieter
- a little more serious
- great!
- It gave me an entirely different look at each sorority and I was SO impressed! (With all!)
- good
- Great- it's wonderful to finally get an idea of the deeper part of a sorority. I feel like I have a better idea of what the sisters are like
- good balance between fun and serious
- gave input on how sororities affect your life after college
- this night was more serious and very touching. The sisters were very sweet
- I almost cried because they all loved each other so much
- more serious
- loved it
- It really showed the bonds between the sisters and was more emotional
- more solemn
- same, more serious though
- it was much more "them trying to impress you"
- This night was SO much FUN!
- I liked this night a lot
- It was a lot more emotional
- I thought it gave you a view of then other sides of sororities
- Interesting, touching, more serious
- The night was really neat and much more emotional than others
- fine
- I got a better feel for sororities
- It was a bit long, but songs and alumni were good
- Not as lighthearted. Hard. We are getting nervous and they are crying at songs.
- I felt as if I really knew so many of the sisters and conversations were far away from small talk
- It was great
- It was boring, except I realized how much the sisters care about each other
- More serious, more confusing
- The sisters seemed more real
- A little long
- It was much more serious
- Seemed more serious, and more personable
- Good, very meaningful
- more meaningful and informative
- It was very fun-it gave us more of an insight
- much more informative
- This rule is very emotional and you see the serious side of the sorority
- great
- It was nicer because the parties were smaller
- I was more comfortable because I knew more people at each sorority
- 15 minutes is not enough to get from Sarah Brunet to Keller without running
- It was a good opportunity to see the "sister" bond.
- It was cool.
- It was more serious, more educational.
- more serious
- Definitely more serious, but really good because it gave me insight into the sisters' true feelings toward their sororities!
- I felt this night gave us a night to discuss more serious issues.
- I liked having a more serious night.
- Good view of what sisterhood means.
- Tonight was a bit more serious, however, it was still very informal.
- More conversations, and more serious.
- Almost the same.
- The alumni were a good help.

- It was more serious and nice.
- Much more serious, but addressed my concerns.
- It was great having the chance to listen to the thoughts and experiences of alumni. It definitely convinced me that sisterhood is something I want to be a part of.
- It gave me more of an impression of how the sisters feel about their sorority.
- Touching
- Fun
- Pretty much the same, with more history.
- Same. A little easier to talk.
- It's basically the same, a little more serious.
- This was a good night. I had a lot of fun.
- Overall it was a lot more somber-the speeches that is.
- Not as interesting as other nights.
- It was OK-good to hear alumni night-some boring conversations.
- Similar-more touching
- More formal.
- It was a little more stressful and a lot more serious.
- It was very somber and emotional.
- Kind of boring(the programs at least)
- Very good addition-interesting and a lot more serious.
- Same
- Good
- Awesome!
- It was nice to see the more serious side.
- Instead of being silly and goofy, the sisters showed the seriousness to being into a sorority.
- It was really helpful in seeing how excited even the alumni would get.
- I learned a lot more about my comfortability level at the different sororities because the presentations and conversations were deeper and more comprehensive.
- Very touching, truly felt bonds of sisterhood.
- Good to see the sisterhood of the group.
- Very insightful into what sisterhood is really about.
- It was more sentimental and gave me greater insight into the sorority
- I liked it but I liked the skit night best!!
- More emotional.
- Much more serious and learned so much about the sisters.
- Gives much better feel for sorority.
- Very serious.
- It was a lot more serious.
- It gave me more insight as to which sororities were closer.
- Serious, but sincere.
- Fun, informative, touching.
- I loved it. It made everything clearer to me.
- It made me feel a part of it.
- Gave better insight on sisterhood.
- Good to hear the serious aspects.
- Tonight the sisters were more personal and sincere.
- Good because it's serious.
- Very enjoyable and personable.
- Good-not as fun, but interesting.
- More serious and I liked seeing the other side to the girls.
- It was awesome.
- It was a good idea.
- Sad-emotional.
- I really talked freely with sisters.
- it was good because it was relaxed.
- Fun.
- It was much more serious and touching. I feel I know a lot more about sisterhood and its place in each sorority.
- It was more serious but important.
- It is so much more serious.
- Good, but kind of emotional.
- Very good!
- More serious aspects.
- I thought it was more serious and I liked it very much.
- It was more serious, but it also gave me a view of another side of sororities.
- More serious-good.
- More serious, but still relaxed.
- Very helpful, informative.
- I loved it. It showed me the true sisterhood that is in each sorority.

- Much more serious- learned more about the sisters and how they interact.
- It was much more serious-which was greatly needed.
- Serious.
- Oh yeah!
- tonight was great. The alumna did a great job!
- Good but very somber.
- Helped to make decision-good.
- It falls at an appropriate place in the order of events to maximize its effect.
- I didn't like the seriousness of it.
- It was nice-I got a feeling of "sisterhood"
- Wonderful.
- More serious-confusing
- It was good.
- It was nice.
- Good.
- Great because I felt more comfortable
- It really helped me with my decisions.
- Much more in depth about personal meaning.
- It was good conversation wise but not so much fun as philanthropy night.
- I thought it was great!
- It wasn't as fun, but got more of a feeling of the sisterhood.
- Much more serious but a good understanding of what it means in long run.
- Great!
- Good-made my decision more clear.
- it was a big transition from last time, but the time went by just as fast.

Question #4 : Do you feel that at this point in Rush you have an understanding of what sisterhood is?

- Definitely- rush has turned out to be a positive event
- much so
- good night!
- good
- Nine girls responded with, "Definitely."
- yes, tonight was a big help and lots of fun
- yes, I definitely feel like I know what sisterhood is
- Ninety-three girls responded with, "Yes."
- Four girls responded with, "Yes, definitely."
- Very much so.
- Yes
- yes
- Pretty much
- Yes
- A little, but I think that you need to be a part of it to get a true understanding.
- Yes.
- Yep.
- Pretty much.
- yes
- yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, definitely
- Yes!!
- I don't think I could really know until I am in one.
- More than other nights
- Yes, and I hope I can be a part of it.
- Yes! I can't wait to be one-if I get the chance.
- Yes, very much so.
- To a limited extent.
- yes, but it is hard to understand what it is like without experiencing it for yourself.
- Absolutely
- Yes, rush is going a lot better than I thought it would.
- I have an understanding of what sisterhood is to some people. I believe sisterhood is different for each person.
- To a fairly good extent.
- maybe my understanding is clearer, but I definitely would have enjoyed more time though I realize that isn't really possible.
- yes I have made a complete 180 from my preconceptions.

- yes. Very much so.
- Yes. Very much.
- yes, I have learned so much!
- Exactly
- Yes, very much so.
- Yes, I think tonight gave me a great idea of sisterhood.
- I have a better idea than what I did previously.
- Very much.
- Yes, very much so.
- Yes, very much so.
- Yes-but to truly understand what sisterhood is, you have to experience it first hand
- Indeed.
- Yes, kind of.
- yes, I feel I have a good understanding.
- Yes, I definitely know I want to be in a sorority.
- yes, for the most part.